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President Eisenhower has always had a special place in my heart. In June of 1958, he signed the document that commissioned me as a Second Lieutenant of Infantry in the United States Army and started me on my career of service to the nation. But more important to me than his signature on my commission is the example that he gives to all Americans of commitment to duty and of commitment to country.

His model of devoted service persuaded me, and many others in my generation, to remain in the military after Vietnam, when things were at their darkest. We knew then how vitally important it would be for the future security of our nation to rebuild and to update our armed forces in the early 1970s. After all, we remembered, General Eisenhower had labored without fame, or fortune, or fanfare, in very similar circumstances, in an under-supported and under-valued army in the isolationist decades before World War II.

Eisenhower was a brilliant forger of alliances, partnerships and coalitions. A master at using the full range of of diplomatic, political, and economic resources to win World War II, he also used those resources to win the peace. As president, he used the same resources to lay the national security foundation that led to victory in the Cold War. He once wrote to his devoted and loving wife, Mamie, that to run the coalition meant that he had to be a bit of a diplomat, a lawyer, a salesman, a socialite, and incidentally a soldier. His words rang true to me during the Gulf War, and they still ring true as we fight our great multi-front war against international terrorism.

It is especially timely for us now to recall and to memorialize one of America’s greatest heroes, Dwight David Eisenhower — liberator of Europe, first steward of NATO, and builder of peace. Eisenhower was a great student of history long before he helped make it, and he passed down his love of history and his commitment to public service to new generations. Rarely in history has there been an individual who combined as he did high accomplishment and great humility. What he did was never for himself. It was for his country. It was always for us. *
Dwight David Eisenhower left the United States of America and its people a great legacy that deserves our respect today and in future generations. As a military leader, as the nation’s President, and as a citizen deeply dedicated to democracy, Eisenhower compiled a record of public service that has won for him a unique place in the history of this country and the world in the twentieth century.

In the realm of military and national security affairs, Eisenhower’s vision, his character, and his outstanding leadership are analyzed in the following report by General Andrew J. Goodpaster (chair), Robert R. Bowie, and Carlo D’Este. As supreme commander of the Allied military coalition in World War II — in the Mediterranean and then in Northwest Europe — General Eisenhower made the crucial and frequently controversial decisions that led to victory. He held together the military alliance. The shining moment for his command came at D-Day in early June 1944, when he led his successful Allied forces in the greatest amphibious invasion in history. By the war’s end in 1945, he was one of the most acclaimed men of the century, and in the years that followed, this distinguished public servant was in turn Chief of Staff of the Army, President of Columbia University, and first supreme commander of the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He relentlessly promoted unity among the nations allied in opposition to communist aggression, as he did among the services in the U.S. military establishment. One of his most important innovations after he became President of the United States was to place all military operations in a unified command structure. As President, he led the nation through repeated challenges from the U.S.S.R. and China and developed the basic strategy that would guide our policy for the remaining three decades before the Soviet collapse. He was masterful in his handling of the Suez Crisis in 1956-57, and it was a tribute to his leadership that he was able to keep the alliance with our leading European allies together after peace was restored.

The Eisenhower Presidency (1953-61) was distinguished above all by peace and prosperity. As the report by Daun van Ee (chair), Michael J. Birkner, and
John H. Morrow, Jr., demonstrates, Eisenhower, who was firm when directly challenged, was nevertheless always prepared to make the kind of fruitful compromises that were as essential to international relations as they were to democratic government at home. He brought the Korean War to an end and then prepared the U.S. defense establishment for a long struggle to maintain the containment policy without damaging the American economy or breaking down the civil liberties that were essential to our democratic government. There was pressure to overspend on defense, especially after the Soviet Union launched its Sputnik earth satellite in 1957. Fear that the United States had fallen behind the communist countries and was threatened by long-range atomic attacks yielded a sense of panic and a rush to respond. Eisenhower responded by calming the public fear while guiding the government towards eventual victory, both in space and armaments, at a reasonable cost. Steering between war and conciliation, President Eisenhower dealt forcefully with the Chinese effort to seize the islands off the mainland held by America’s Chinese Nationalist allies.

Throughout, he insisted on a show of good faith before he would negotiate in summit conferences, and he sought always to avoid unrealistic expectations about what such meetings could accomplish. As the French and British empires collapsed, he worked hard to maintain the support of these allies in Europe while helping to ease them out of their colonial possessions. At home, he stayed on the Middle Way, seeking to balance the budget (a goal achieved for three budget years), facilitate creative change in civil rights for African-Americans, and promote economic development with a new federally sponsored interstate highway system. Challenged on civil rights in Little Rock, Arkansas, he forcefully demonstrated that neither mobs nor a belligerent governor could defy the federal courts. The keys to his leadership as president were “strength and civility.” Eisenhower’s presidency was indeed a triumph of character.

Central to the Eisenhower legacy was his relationship to the American public, a relationship based securely on a shared democratic ethic. Michael Beschloss (chair), Kiron Skinner, and Richard Norton Smith explore the manner in which Eisenhower’s basic values were shaped by his upbringing in Abilene, Kansas, where he learned from an early age to balance team play with
leadership, cooperation with competition, and individual striving with service to others. In the years that followed he never lost his faith in the ability of the people to decide for themselves who their leaders should be and what policies they should implement. His values were reinforced at the U.S. Military Academy, and the motto “Duty, Honor, Country” became the bedrock for his life of service to the nation. In effect, the story of that life of service became an essential part of his legacy to the people he loved and led. As a leader, he was interested in making society and its basic institutions successful and efficient. Precise about responsibilities and authority, he was a relentlessly positive and forceful commander and executive. He worked endlessly to promote cooperation and compromise in every institution he served. His conviction as President that the middle way between extremes was the best way for a democracy to succeed was deeply grounded in his fundamental values and his experiences as a military officer, president of a leading educational institution, and commander of the military forces in Europe for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. While promoting individualism and cooperation, he fully understood that the United States could not always avoid conflict and needed strong national programs if the country was going to continue to lead the free world against communist aggression. He improved and strengthened the nation’s military forces, established the guiding principles for U.S. exploration of space, and promoted the transportation infrastructure the country needed for national security and economic prosperity. By blending traditional American values with a vigorous emphasis upon internationalism, he helped usher the nation into a new age. *
You are about to embark upon the great crusade, toward which we have striven these many months. The eyes of the world are upon you....

I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty and skill in battle.

We will accept nothing less than full victory.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

D-DAY, JUNE 6, 1944

(INSCRIPTION, NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.)
Dwight David Eisenhower’s legacy in military and security affairs embraces historic world achievements in peace and war — achievements to which his leadership contributed in great measure. It includes as well the acts and accomplishments that portray the brand of leadership he exercised and above all the foundation stones of character — principles, convictions and personal values — that guided him in all he did. His legacy is found not only in high-impact, high-visibility historic achievements such as victory in Europe during World War II, but also in less public, less well known yet highly important contributions to national security and to the maintenance of powerful yet soundly budgeted military forces. His principled leadership and professional strengths were of great value to the country during times of grave danger, and they offer today and for the future important lessons to our nation and its leaders.

Several of Eisenhower’s many outstanding accomplishments during World War II stand out and typify his leadership as a general and as a citizen. As supreme commander, first in the Mediterranean in 1942-43, and later in Northwest Europe in 1944-45, he was the heart and soul of the Allied military coalition. By dint of his vision and steadfast determination, the Allies were able to forge the winning partnership that brought about victory. Almost single-hand-
Whether he was handling his difficult, often exhausting relations with Churchill, satisfying Roosevelt, or responding to pressure from General Marshall and the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Eisenhower never forgot that his first responsibility was to lead the coalition to the best of his ability.

Edly, he established the parameters by which the war against the Axis powers was fought. In so doing, Eisenhower had to overcome enormous problems and confront endless criticism that might well have caused others to bow under the pressure and lose the unity of this complex command. He always acted as a supreme commander in what he believed were the best interests of that command. He never shied from controversy, even when it could have seriously jeopardized his future. In North Africa, Eisenhower’s controversial decision to back a Vichy French official for military reasons might easily have led to his dismissal as the Allied commander. Then a rookie commander of limited experience, he made an unpopular, potentially explosive decision without consideration of the personal consequences of going against the wishes of Roosevelt, his own commander-in-chief, and the British prime minister Winston Churchill. Meeting Roosevelt at Casablanca, Eisenhower candidly told the President that “generals could make mistakes and be fired but governments could not.”

With a combination of tact, diplomacy, determination, and, when necessary, arm-twisting, Eisenhower created a truly international headquarters, first in the Mediterranean and later in England. As he matured into his job, he proved himself capable of penetrating independent thought in dealing with the unprecedented strategic challenges that headquarters faced. When necessary, he was the great conciliator who held together the military alliance. Whether he was handling his difficult, often exhausting relations with Churchill, satisfying Roosevelt, or responding to pressure from General Marshall and the Combined Chiefs of Staff, Eisenhower never forgot that his first responsibility was to lead the coalition to the best of his ability. The war, he knew, would be won not by Americans or Britons but by allies fighting in a common cause.

Eisenhower’s shining moment came in the difficult days before D-Day in early June 1944. When the weather in the English Channel made it impossible to carry out the
invasion of Normandy on June 5, he was obliged to postpone Operation Overlord, the greatest amphibious invasion in history. Faced with what, at best, was a dangerously marginal weather forecast for June 6, he made the most difficult decision any military commander has ever been called upon to make. His belief in the predictions that the weather would hold led to a decision that ultimately determined the outcome of the war. Had Overlord failed, he was fully prepared to accept sole responsibility. Well after D-Day his naval aide found a note in his shirt pocket that Eisenhower had scribbled before the invasion. It read:

*Our landings in the Cherbourg-Havre area have failed to gain a satisfactory foothold and I have withdrawn the troops. My decision to attack at this time and place was based upon the best information available. The troops, the air, and the Navy did all that bravery and devotion to duty could do. If any blame or fault attaches to the attempt it is mine alone – June 5, 1944.*

No commander ever cared more for the safety and well being of his soldiers. Shortly after D-Day he wrote: “The soldiers, sailors, and airmen are indescribable in their elan, courage, determination and fortitude. They inspire me.” To his generals he was a stern, demanding commander, but to his troops he was simply “Ike.”

When Germany launched what became known as the Battle of the Bulge on December 16, 1944, Eisenhower acted without hesitation to redress what soon became a grave situation. His decision to reinforce Bastogne and St. Vith led directly to a disastrous setback for Germany and helped end the war in the spring of 1945. Throughout, he supported British Field Marshal Sir Bernard Montgomery’s command of the northern portion of the front despite vigorous protests from his American subordinates: Allied considerations always came before national ones for Eisenhower.

Although by war’s end Dwight Eisenhower was one of the most acclaimed men of the century, he remained modest in victory. When he reported the surrender of German forces, he penned a brief cable utterly devoid of self-congratulation: “The mission of this Allied force was fulfilled at 0241 hours, local time, May 7, 1945.” Many years later,
Japan, he skillfully guided the establishment through a period of severe turbulence and sometimes chaotic change. Of lasting significance were his steadfast efforts in behalf of unification of the nation’s armed services and establishment of the U.S. Air Force, historic changes achieved in the National Security Act of 1947.

During his presidency of Columbia University, he was asked to return to the Pentagon to preside as informal Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as they prepared the first consolidated budget of the newly unified military establishment. The task proved to be historic in its significance as well as its difficulty. Eisenhower’s role required every bit of his unique professional military skills and persuasive abilities. He helped the Service Chiefs clarify realistic security needs, define a unified strategy to meet them, and come together on the plans, programs and budgets to carry that strategy out. His leadership, which embodied his dedication to our national security as a higher goal than the self-interests of the separate services, provided lessons we can still profit from today.

In late 1950, President Truman called on him again, this time to serve NATO as its first Supreme Allied Commander (SACEUR). In order to block communist aggression...
in Europe, Eisenhower was charged with forming a collective military force. He quickly established Allied Headquarters (SHAPE) and an integrated command structure, binding NATO’s national forces in Europe through regional commands under his overall direction, with full participation of European officers of all services — land, sea and air. His leadership and the rapid, visible progress it evoked on operational planning, training, equipping and infrastructure for the force quickly brought a higher sense of confidence to NATO. Only one man in the world could have done it, and he did it exceedingly well. He worked closely with those advisors reconciling in a realistic way the needs of defense with the politico-economic capabilities of the member nations. In particular, he promoted the ultimately successful effort to bring a West German military force into the NATO defense. His accomplishments in the vital task of consolidating NATO’s military structure help explain the contrast between the catastrophic carnage of the first half of the twentieth century and the tense but relatively peaceful changes of the second half of the century.

In 1953, Eisenhower took office as President of the United States during a challenging stage of the Cold War against communism. The Soviet nuclear arsenal had been growing steadily, and when Stalin died in March 1953, he left that awesome power in the hands of untested successors. The Communist victory in China, the outbreak of the Korean War, and the struggle in Vietnam had expanded the Cold War to Asia. The collapse of colonialism was spawning numbers of weak, poor and vulnerable states. And the strategy (embodied in National Security Council document 68) Truman had adopted in mid-1950 in response to the Soviet nuclear test and the attack in Korea was in grave disarray.

Eisenhower’s experience in security and world affairs uniquely prepared him to meet this challenge. He had two bedrock convictions: First, that a major nuclear war would be suicidal for all of the participants; security required the United States to prevent nuclear war as well as counter the Soviet threat. Second, that if this effort were successful, the United States never lost a soldier or a foot of ground in my administration. We kept the peace. People ask how it happened — by God, it didn’t just happen, I’ll tell you that.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

We live not in an instant of peril but in an age of peril.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, 1953
Eisenhower firmly believed that sound policy required an orderly process to marshal data on the issues, to ensure thorough analysis, and to benefit from informed debate among the key officials, including the President.

Cold War would be a “long haul,” depending as much on political and economic factors as on military capability; a viable strategy would have to balance and integrate all three. During his two administrations, Eisenhower met these criteria.

Eisenhower firmly believed that sound policy required an orderly process to marshal data on the issues, to ensure thorough analysis, and to benefit from informed debate among the key officials, including the President. The aim was to produce the coherent strategy and clear guidelines for policy that would provide a solid foundation for decisions in the Oval Office. Eisenhower quickly overhauled the National Security Council (NSC). A Planning Board, composed of agency officials appointed by the President, prepared policy papers for discussion at the NSC’s regular meetings, with the President actively participating. The process was managed by a Special Assistant who was not a policy advisor. The personal interest of the President assured that the papers were meticulously staffed and highlighted new policies, that the NSC members came well prepared, and that the NSC debate was lively.

Following Stalin’s death, for instance, Eisenhower initiated a special exercise (called Solarium) for an intensive examination of alternative policies toward the Soviet Union. Three teams of experts developed three possible strategies and presented their reports to an all-day session of the NSC, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Planning Board, and other relevant officials. Their reports were then turned over to the NSC Planning Board as input for preparation of the administration’s first Basic National Strategy.

The Eisenhower strategy was his most significant contribution to the conduct and outcome of the Cold War. This new strategy revised the appraisal of a Soviet threat, the objectives, and the means embodied in NSC68. It rejected the prospect of Soviet attack by a date of maximum danger. The threat could be deterred, Eisenhower concluded, by a secure retaliatory capacity and Soviet expansion thus contained indefinitely until eroded by internal decay and deterioration. Coerced “roll-back” of Soviet power was rejected. The military
forces and other means of applying pressure must be sustainable by the U.S. and its allies over a “long-haul” of many decades. Economic vitality and political cohesion were critical components of security. Under Ike, the United States would seek agreements with the Soviet Union to serve common interests, such as avoiding the risks of nuclear war by miscalculation or accident. This country and its allies would assist the post-colonial states to strengthen their regimes and societies to become less vulnerable to subversion.

The Suez Crisis threatened to disrupt Eisenhower’s strategy. He was convinced that the United Nations and its principles were important steps toward a more peaceful world. When Egyptian President Nasser seized the Suez Canal in July 1956, Eisenhower insisted on seeking to resolve the resulting dispute by diplomacy and negotiation without resorting to force, in keeping with the United Nations Charter. After three months of diplomacy, however, the United Kingdom, France and Israel secretly conspired to attack Egypt on October 29 to unseat Nasser (each for its own reasons). Eisenhower decided at once to oppose their aggression by promptly obtaining a United Nations Resolution condemning the action and demanding a ceasefire and withdrawal of forces. He was convinced that acquiescing in this blatant violation of the Charter would be a lethal blow to the United Nations. He was not deterred by the alliance, the impending election on November 6, or the regrettable inability to prevent the Soviet invasion of Hungary. His policy succeeded insofar as U.S. economic pressure quickly compelled Britain and France to comply, and Eisenhower’s threat to support sanctions forced Israel to do so in several months. While acting decisively, Eisenhower skillfully countered Soviet efforts to exploit the crisis and moved quickly to mend the allied breach after the withdrawals.

During his presidency, Eisenhower reshaped the armed forces to reinforce his basic strategy and improve their effectiveness. To enhance deterrence, he launched early programs to develop the ballistic and submarine-borne missiles that would ensure an invulnerable retaliatory capacity. The U-2 over-flight program was designed to penetrate

The nature of today’s weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies.

SPEECH TO U. N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AUGUST 13, 1958

National security requires far more than military power.
Economic and moral factors play indispensable roles.
STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE, JANUARY 10, 1957
Eisenhower’s military and national security legacy as a President thus included eight years of secure peace and a coherent basic strategy that would be sustained for the remaining three decades before the Soviet collapse.

I know that the American people share my deep belief that if a danger exists in the world, it is a danger shared by all; and equally, that if hope exists in the mind of one nation, that hope should be shared by all.

“ATOMS FOR PEACE” SPEECH, DECEMBER 8, 1953
Dwight David Eisenhower's eight-year presidency (1953-1961) left a legacy as powerful and lasting as his military career. The two Eisenhower administrations remain memorable first because they helped to bring America both peace and prosperity, and second because the process by which the President achieved his goals provides our generation and those in the future with an outstanding example of sound, effective leadership.

After World War II General of the Army Eisenhower, the world-renowned conqueror of the Nazi military machine, looked forward to a peaceful retirement. His goal was to finish his working career at a small college in a quiet town, where he could mold young minds and preach the American values that had shaped his country's history. It was not to be. Friends prevailed upon him to take up the presidency at Columbia University in the great metropolis of New York. This would, they said, provide him with a more visible platform from which to spread his message. Next, Secretary of Defense James Forrestal persuaded him to come back to Washington to advise him on national security matters and to serve as unofficial chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Late in 1950, as the Cold War threatened to explode into a nuclear holocaust, President Harry S. Truman again appealed to his sense of duty and selected him to be the
Eisenhower’s approach, which emphasized calmness and rationality during times of crisis, also characterized his handling of the greatest problem of foreign policy — dealing with the Soviets and the Communist Chinese.

first Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, for the new NATO military organization in Western Europe. Finally, in 1952, he responded to yet another call to duty. Political leaders and public officials called upon Eisenhower to run for the presidency. They admired the modest, selfless, and soft-spoken war hero, and they trusted Ike to lead them safely through dangers at home and abroad. The General complied with their wishes. He had devoted his entire life to public service in fulfillment of obligations to his country and to humanity, and he quickly began to prepare himself for leadership in a new realm. Learning by doing, he overcame some early mistakes and his electoral triumph in November 1952 was decisive.

The gravest and most immediate problems faced by the new President involved America’s great global struggle against communism. The Cold War had flared into a bloody, stalemated conflict on the Korean peninsula, and Eisenhower was determined to bring it to a close. After a fact-finding trip to Korea to assess the situation for himself, he concluded that further exertions by the U.S.-led United Nations forces were unwise. He decided to force negotiations toward an honorable peace, one that would leave the southern half of Korea in freedom and would also allow captive North Korean soldiers the right to decide for themselves whether to return to their totalitarian state. Eisenhower’s firmness and his suggestion that nuclear weapons might be used in the conflict were enough to persuade the communists to accept an armistice and bring the war to an end.

Once this great drain on America’s resources had ended, Eisenhower could pursue his goal of trying to rationalize the nation’s defenses. He had always decried the cyclical feast-or-famine approach toward the military, one in which drastic cutbacks (such as those that had occurred after both the world wars) had alternated with reckless spending sprees. The best approach was to structure the defense establishment for the long pull by carefully planning for the force levels that the American economy could sustain for the extended period that the Cold War was likely to last. Working with Congress and the Joint Chiefs of
Staff, and taking pains to educate the public about the necessity for avoiding unnecessary costs, he was able to restrain the momentum toward redundant armaments. The political pressures to overspend on defense rose dramatically after the Soviet Union launched its Sputnik earth satellite in the fall of 1957 — leading to fears that the Soviets were ahead of the United States in their ability to launch long-range atomic strikes. In this difficult situation, the President demonstrated once again the kind of effective leadership that had long distinguished his career. He was able to calm the public and the media and to provide for eventual victory, in both space and armaments, at a reasonable cost. In 1958 he established the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration — NASA — whose accomplishments have continued to testify to his vision. He ended his tenure in office with a warning to future generations to avoid the excesses of the “military-industrial complex.”

Eisenhower's approach, which emphasized calmness and rationality during times of crisis, also characterized his handling of the greatest problem of foreign policy — dealing with the Soviets and the Communist Chinese. The most serious crises occurred in 1954-55 and in 1958, when the People's Republic of China adopted a belligerent stance toward two small islands, Quemoy and Matsu, occupied by America's Chinese Nationalist allies. Many political leaders in the United States called for an all-out pre-emptive strike against the Chinese mainland. Others felt that the islands were not worth the risk of a global thermonuclear war. Eisenhower decided that the islands had real, if symbolic, value, and that their retention helped

*Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.*

**Dwight D. Eisenhower,** 1953

**September 8, 1960** Eisenhower tours the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Huntsville, Alabama, with Wernher von Braun.

(Dwight D. Eisenhower Library)
EISENHOWER’S LEGACY

He insisted upon demonstrations of his opponents’ good faith before he would sit down with their leaders at summit conferences: in 1955 he met with the Soviets at Geneva only after they pulled their army out of Austria, and in 1959-60 he refused to hold talks with Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev until he abandoned his menacing ultimatum against the Western nations in Berlin. When Khrushchev threatened to cancel the Paris Summit talks unless the American President issued a humiliating apology for having sent a U-2 reconnaissance plane into Russian air space (May 1960), Eisenhower refused to knuckle under. Such activities, he explained, were the necessary if distasteful measures that kept the free world safe.

The United States, then as now, was the leader of the free nations, and Eisenhower’s stature was a major factor in maintaining that leadership position. In so doing he had to face a number of problems that could be resolved only with a precise mix of tact and firmness. America’s main allies, Great Britain and France, desired to retain many parts of their vast colonial empires. The indigenous colonial people, however, wanted freedom from foreign rule. Eisenhower sympathized with these legitimate aspirations, and he helped ease the transition to an overwhelmingly noncommunist post-colonial world while maintaining the loyalty and support in international affairs.
of America’s traditional friends. The most serious crisis occurred late in 1956, when the British, French, and Israelis invaded Egypt in an attempt to reclaim the nationalized Suez Canal from the government of Gamal Abdul Nasser. Eisenhower insisted on a peaceful settlement. Working through the United Nations, he was able to compel the invading forces to withdraw. In 1958, when instability threatened to convulse the Middle East, the President swiftly sent American peacekeeping forces into Lebanon. His decisive actions permitted peaceful resolution of a local problem that might have spilled over into surrounding areas and endangered the delicate balance of forces in that important region.

Eisenhower’s approach to foreign policy entailed support for the United Nations and NATO, reduction of tariffs and promotion of freer trade. He aggressively promoted increased commercial, social and cultural contacts by individual citizens around the world. His leadership revitalized the national two-party system by turning the Republican mainstream away from the isolationism of the 1920s and 1930s. In its place he achieved a national consensus for an internationalist approach to America’s role in the world.

In domestic affairs, Eisenhower pursued what he called the Middle Way. A centrist path, he thought, was the best and safest way toward lasting progress. The wisdom of this approach was apparent in the field of internal security, where Senator Joseph McCarthy had for some time been endangering civil liberties in his quest to root out Communist subversion. Eisenhower refused to engage in character assassinations, book burnings, or witch hunts. Instead, he worked within the law to protect the nation from disloyalty and espionage. One knowledgeable observer characterized his method as “vigilance without fanaticism.”

It is with the book of history, and not with isolated pages, that the United States will ever wish to be identified.

“ATOMS FOR PEACE” SPEECH, DECEMBER 8, 1953
Through the Civil Rights Act of 1957, President Eisenhower attempted to push for further change by securing the right to vote. He knew this was one of the important steps that needed to be taken to redress racial discrimination.

Some of the thorniest issues facing the United States in the 1950s had to do with civil rights. The Eisenhower Administration completed Harry Truman's desegregation of the armed forces. Attorney General Herbert Brownell also filed an *amicus curae* (friend of the court) brief in Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education, the landmark case that dissolved legally mandated segregation in seventeen southern states, giving impetus to a civil rights revolution whose true leaders were Rosa Parks and a young Montgomery, Alabama minister, Martin Luther King, Jr. When Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus challenged the supremacy of the federal judiciary, Eisenhower responded by sending troops to escort the Little Rock Nine to class at Central High, where the ancient doctrine of “separate, but equal” no longer prevailed.

Through the Civil Rights Act of 1957, President Eisenhower attempted to push for further change by securing the right to vote. He knew this was one of the important steps that needed to be taken to redress racial discrimination. He believed that democracy could be enhanced and secured by such incremental steps through adherence to well-established democratic and legal procedures. Eisenhower was not, however, naïve about the hard leadership choices that were necessary to move the process along. Reluctant to force the South in the sensitive field of school desegregation, he nonetheless took decisive military action to enforce the law when an obstructionist governor and racist mobs defied federal court orders in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1957.

Eisenhower's moderate approach was nowhere more apparent than in his efforts to put the nation's finances, and the national economy, on a sound footing. He put the federal budget into structural balance by reducing expenditures and staving off demands for unwise tax cuts. The economy flourished, and the gross national product jumped from $365 billion to $520 billion. In three fiscal years actual budget surpluses were recorded, and the rate of inflation dropped dramatically. These actions allowed America to experience a sustained period of solid economic growth, which was further spurred by his ambitious program of building interstate highways (now called the...
Eisenhower System of Interstate Highways). This massive public-works program was at Eisenhower’s insistence financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through user taxes on gasoline.

All these accomplishments were the result of Eisenhower’s leadership skills, which featured, as General Andrew J. Goodpaster has said, “strength and civility.” Striving to achieve cooperation while avoiding unnecessary friction or resentment, he was able to gain the respect of the world’s peoples and leaders. He refused to question the motives of those who opposed him and declined to engage in personality disputes. Indeed, Eisenhower made it a point never to mention a name publicly unless it was in a favorable context. Within his Administration, he guided a strong executive team toward agreed-upon goals. Eisenhower welcomed dissenting opinions, insisting only that once a decision had been made that all subordinates should support it loyally. The best statement of his methods and goals was given at the outset of his presidency in a letter to William Phillips, a former colleague from World War II:

“In my view, a fair, decent, and reasonable dealing with men, a reasonable recognition that views may diverge, a constant seeking for a high and strong ground on which to work together, is the best way to lead our country in the difficult times ahead of us. A living democracy needs diversity to keep it strong. For survival, it also needs to have the diversities brought together in a common purpose, so fair, so reasonable, and so appealing that all can rally to it.

At the close of his final term Eisenhower could look back with satisfaction at his years in office and even with characteristic modesty credit himself with having played a large role in America’s achievements. So, now, can we. Eisenhower’s presidency was a triumph of character. *

Let no one say that we shun the conference table.
“ATOMS FOR PEACE” SPEECH, DECEMBER 8, 1953

Without tolerance, without understanding for each other or without a spirit of brotherhood, we would soon cease to exist as a great nation.
JANUARY 30, 1955

September, 1957 Eisenhower signs the Civil Rights Legislation, Newport, Rhode Island.
(Dwight D. Eisenhower Library)
I come from the very heart of America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER
Dwight David Eisenhower’s life of public service was built around certain basic values that he shared with most Americans. Central to his thought and his public image was a powerful dedication to democracy, that is, to the right of the people to choose their own government and to judge the policies and the leaders who implemented the nation’s public programs. Whether those programs were conducted in local or state governments or in Washington, D.C., Eisenhower was confident that the people could over the long haul decide for themselves what they wanted their public authorities to decide and do and what they wanted to decide and do for themselves. His confidence in the people was returned to him manifold when they expressed their confidence in his judgment of what was best for the country.

Eisenhower’s democratic ethic was solidly grounded in the experiences of his family life, his childhood, and his education. Sharing a small home in Abilene, Kansas, with a large family, he learned from an early age decisive lessons about the give and take that democratic government inherently requires. Ike celebrated Abilene as an extended family and a classroom in self-sufficiency. For him the town was a leveling ground where bloodlines counted for little, and bank accounts for less. Compromise and team play were as essential at home as they
The individual loomed large in that setting, and even though most of Eisenhower’s career would take place in large national and international organizations, he never lost his sense for the importance of individual effort as a building block of democracy and our distinctive American form of political economy.

were in sports and local government. Here too, he began to learn something important about sharing and service to others. Taking part in small-town Kansas society and its educational system taught him to appreciate the role individuals could play in shaping lives and careers and providing the entire community with leadership. The individual loomed large in that setting, and even though most of Eisenhower’s career would take place in large national and international organizations, he never lost his sense for the importance of individual effort as a building block of democracy and our distinctive American form of political economy. These fundamental values were reinforced at the U.S. Military Academy, and to Eisenhower “Duty, Honor, Country” became his call to a lifetime of service to the nation. As a consequence, his life story became an essential part of his legacy to the American people.

Eisenhower’s dedication to democracy and leadership involved a pragmatic idealism attuned to the needs of a modern administrative state. No philosopher, he was interested in making society and those institutions in which he worked successful and efficient. Neither a company of soldiers nor a university nor the presidency could serve democracy without effective, engaged leadership, and Eisenhower thought a great deal about how leaders should behave. He had high standards for himself and others. No matter how bitter the internal struggles were—either in his great unified international commands in World War II, in NATO or in the presidency—he worked endlessly to promote cooperation and compromise. He was precise about responsibilities and authority, and thus civil-military relations never created a problem in his mind: civil authority had to be supreme or democracies would falter. His constitutionalism as general and as president was unyielding. Leaders, he believed, had an obligation to develop and implement effective strategies, but they also had to be ever mindful of the morale of those who served with them. He was relentlessly positive to those around
him even in moments of great stress such as D-Day, the Sputnik crisis, and the U-2 affair.

The challenges of military leadership led him to write during World War II, “Without confidence, enthusiasm and optimism in the command, victory is scarcely obtainable.” His unique embodiment of these traits, and his skill and courage in planning and executing the invasion of Normandy on D-day, June 6, 1944, won him both the respect and the extraordinary affection of his fellow citizens. His leadership during the crisis of World War II elevated him to the rare post of statesman and first citizen of the free world. Lauded and honored, he nevertheless remained humble about his accomplishments and his role in the great alliance. He became an international leader who remembered, as he once explained, “I come from the very heart of America.” Thus he was a genuine representative and reflection of the American people in the crucial years when this nation was becoming a global leader. His broad humanitarianism was combined with a profound internationalism grounded in his sure sense that American security depended upon the manner in which the United States met its global responsibilities. As a result he was unusually successful in representing American values to the world at large in both wartime and peace.

For many Americans following the Depression and World War II, the need for a rearticulation of American values and principles was great, and historical circumstances uniquely qualified Eisenhower to meet that need successfully. One of the best known military heroes to emerge from World War II, Eisenhower found himself, as a civilian, the first American president to face nuclear weapons of mass destruction from the beginning of his term.

A feeling came over me that the expression ‘The United States of America’ would now and henceforth mean something different than it had ever before. From here on it would be the nation I would be serving, not myself.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, 1952, REMEMBERING HIS FIRST DAY AT WEST POINT
Eisenhower’s Legacy

presidency. These weapons, capable of destroying mankind itself, and remarkably more varied, complex and threatening to national and international security than any before in history, presented a need for exceptional leadership. To an unusual degree the World War II hero met the new challenge domestically and internationally. Eisenhower’s profound understanding of the scope of the security problem led him to say that political relations now were not “merely man against man or nation against nation. It is man against war.” The universal appeal of his ardent pleas for peace received a widely positive resonance which enhanced his historical stature as a statesman of peace as well as a wartime general.

A better understanding of the great public issues of the day, he was certain, would serve democracy well, and at Columbia University he strongly supported scholarly study of the nature and historical evolution of communism, of war and peace, of human resource issues, and of democratic citizenship. He was deeply disappointed when education and compromise failed to prevent a crisis over civil rights in the South, and he responded quickly and forcefully when federal authority was challenged at Little Rock. With the dispatch to Little Rock, Arkansas, of a thousand paratroopers from the 101st Airborne Division, he left no doubt that the orders of the federal courts would be enforced. Without the rule of law, he reminded Americans, democracy would not work.

Decisive when challenged in this manner, he was nevertheless cautious in his approach to the use of force in national affairs as well as international relations. He actively promoted arms control and believed that by avoiding war and strengthening our economy, we would ultimately win the great Cold War struggle against the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. History proved him right.

He was certain that by rewarding individual effort and encouraging competition, the U.S. style of capitalism had made this nation’s
economy the strongest in the world. Our form of competitive capitalism, he thought, had decisive long-term advantages over authoritarian, centralized communism, so long as we could maintain our cooperative alliances with the other capitalist democracies. On that issue too, history came down on his side.

Like most of his fellow citizens, Eisenhower respected individual effort without losing sight of what government could and should do for its citizens. As president, he brought his style of quiet activism to the task of establishing the strategic architecture needed to protect America's security in the space age. He sought civilian control of space exploration, establishing NASA, and developing at the same time the means to ensure the intelligence gathering from space that would keep America informed of its enemies' capabilities. He fundamentally structured the global arms control and legal regimes for space with which we live today. He also vastly improved the transportation infrastructure essential to national defense with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Transportation Act of 1958 for railroads, and the approval of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1954. Two new states — Alaska and Hawaii — were added to the union on his watch. These accomplishments, combined with his reorganization of the Department of Defense, meant that at the end of his two-term presidency, America was better prepared domestically and internationally to carry to completion the strategy of containing communist power.

As Supreme Commander of Allied forces in World War II, as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, as President of Columbia University, as the military commander of NATO forces, and as President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower established a legacy of great service to American society and to its democratic principles. He induced change by making America's institutions more responsive to American ideals and international realities, and as the last

Public opinion usually wins the war and always wins the peace.
TO HIS FRIEND,
WILLIAM ROBINSON

May 6, 1954 Eisenhower signs H.R. 8127, the highway legislation.
(Dwight D. Eisenhower Library)
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American president born in the 19th century, he was able to provide this nation with a transitional, guiding vision for the last half of the 20th century, a vision that is still compelling today. Eisenhower became a living symbol of continuity and of enduring values in an age of accelerating change. He protected democracy, listened to the voices of the people, and provided powerful leadership in a successful quest to achieve the two goals he knew the American people wanted above all — prosperity and peace. *

Above all things, our causes must be so clearly understood by the masses of the free people that they stand ready to sacrifice for them.

DRAFT OF PERSONAL LETTER TO MARGARET PATTERSON JUNE 15, 1953

The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, JANUARY 21, 1957
As a result of the sacrifices of Americans in the two World Wars, Eisenhower thought deeply about the reasons for America’s wartime losses. Following World War I he carefully studied the battlefields under General Pershing’s guidance, and as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army following World War II he wrote in knowledgeable detail about the appropriate memorialization of the Americans who lost their lives. Later as President, he passionately argued for the building of a memorial to the freedoms for which Americans had died in the 20th century. No other American president was as knowledgeable about and committed to memorialization as it related to American values and sacrifices.

Eisenhower believed very strongly in the value of programs that could serve as living legacies, and he also supported the development of physical memorials whenever he perceived that their creation would inspire the American people and enhance their memory of what had been done to protect the nation and to promote its democratic ideals. An important example of a living legacy was his leadership at Columbia University in sponsoring programs to study the democratic process, to develop public leadership, to stimulate civic participation, and to enhance citizenship as he came to understand it during a life of public service. Among these programs were the American Assembly, the Institute of War and Peace, the Nutrition Center, and a center for the Conservation of Human Resources. He once observed that “every man and woman who enters this university must leave it a better American, or we have failed in our main purpose.”

Eisenhower’s views on physical memorialization were also definite. As Chief of Staff of the United States Army, he wrote in a long letter in 1947 about the location, number and significance of future memorials to World War II, noting

There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, 1950

He was the general who hated war, the president who promoted peace. As a man, he left us with a legacy of love, for people, and for democracy.

STEPHEN E. AMBROSE
the importance of continuing public access to a memorial “to give it some value for succeeding generations.” As president, he sought to build an architectural monument to the American freedoms. In a message to Congress he stated in 1960 that “the story of the noble ideas which shaped our country’s beginning, its course, its great moments, and the men who made it possible, can be furthered in a variety of ways, but the simplest and most effective of all methods in my judgment is to present it impressively in visual form . . . .”

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Commission has determined that both of these concepts, a programmatic or “living” memorial and a physical or architectural memorial — concepts that were advocated by Eisenhower during his lifetime — should be incorporated in the permanent Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial.

The legacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower is of fundamental importance in the planning and designing of this memorial. A significant challenge for the Memorial Commission will be to determine the appropriate means by which the salient findings of this report can be put to best use in memorializing this multifaceted public servant — a man whose life of service affirmed America’s democratic values.

Due to the competition for prime locations in the central core of Washington, D.C., the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Park Service prepared *The Memorials and Museums Master Plan* in 2001. This manual not only identifies a variety of sites but also provides planning guidance for establishing a physical memorial in Washington. A final timetable to complete the Eisenhower memorial has not yet been projected. The Commission is currently working to develop a schedule. ✯
The Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission was created on October 25, 1999 (Public Law 106-79) as a result of legislation sponsored by Senator Ted Stevens (R/Alaska), joined by Senator Daniel K. Inouye (D/Hawaii) and approved by President William J. Clinton. The Commission is charged with memorializing Dwight D. Eisenhower, who served as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe in World War II and subsequently as the 34th President of the United States.

The law states that “... an appropriate permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower should be created to perpetuate his memory and his contributions to the United States,” and further directs that the “Commission shall consider and formulate plans for such a permanent memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower, including its nature, construction and location.”

The Commission consists of twelve members:

Four members appointed by the President:
* D. David Eisenhower (Berwyn, PA),
* Alfred Geduldig (New York, NY),
* Susan Banes Harris (Potomac, MD) and
* Rocco C. Siciliano (Beverly Hills, CA)

Four members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:
* Leonard L. Boswell (D/Iowa),
* Dennis Moore (D/Kansas),
* Jerry Moran (R/Kansas) and
* William (Mac) Thornberry (R/Texas)

Four members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate:
* Daniel K. Inouye (D/Hawaii),
* Jack Reed (D/Rhode Island),
* Pat Roberts (R/Kansas) and
* Ted Stevens (R/Alaska)

Rocco C. Siciliano, a World War II combat decorated infantry veteran who served as Special Assistant to President Eisenhower, was selected as Chairman. Senator Daniel K. Inouye was selected as Vice Chairman.

The Commission established an office with the assistance of the General Services Administration, and a small contract staff began work in June 2001 under the direction of acting executive director Carl W. Reddel (Brig. Gen., USAF, Ret.). Public Law 107-67 (November 12, 2001) and Public Law 107-117 (January 10, 2002) appropriated funds for the administrative support of the Commission and directed that the Commission’s work be undertaken in compliance with the 1986 Commemorative Works Act (Public Law 99-652).
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Executive Committee

**Rocco C. Siciliano** (Chairman)  An attorney, Mr. Siciliano served President Eisenhower in the White House as Special Assistant for Personnel Management. The son of Italian immigrants, he fought with the U.S. Army during World War II as an infantry Platoon Leader in the 10th Mountain Infantry Division in Italy. His combat decorations include the Bronze Star for Valor. In addition to private-sector service as the Chief Executive Officer of two New York Stock Exchange companies, Mr. Siciliano served as President and Chairman of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, as a board member of the J. Paul Getty Trust, and as a member of the National Commission on the Public Service (the Volcker Commission). He was President and then Chairman of the Dwight D. Eisenhower World Affairs Institute from 1991 to 2001. He is Chairman of the Center for Governmental Studies in Los Angeles. After appointment to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Commission by President Clinton, he was selected its Chairman in April 2001.

**Hon. Daniel K. Inouye** (Vice Chairman)  A United States Senator from Hawaii, Mr. Inouye is the third most senior member of the U.S. Senate. A combat-decorated World War II veteran, he won the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart with cluster for his service in France and in Italy. He won election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1959 as the new state’s first congressman. Elected to the U.S. Senate in 1962, he is Ranking Member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Subcommittee, and Vice Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. He served as a member of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission from 1970 to 1997, and as Co-Chair of the Commission from 1990 to 1997.

**Hon. Ted Stevens**  A United States Senator from Alaska, Mr. Stevens is the fifth most senior member of the U.S. Senate. A combat-decorated World War II veteran, he served in the U.S. Army Air Corps and won the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, and the Yuan Hai medal from the Republic of China. After his military service, he moved to Alaska in the early 1950s. President Eisenhower appointed him Solicitor (chief counsel) of the Department of the Interior in 1960. Appointed to the U.S. Senate in 1968 upon the death of Sen. E.L. Bob Bartlett, Mr. Stevens was elected in his own right in 1972 and has served in the Senate since then. He is President Pro Tempore of the Senate and Chairs the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**Hon. Dennis Moore**  A member of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. Moore represents the Third District of Kansas. After service in the U.S. Army and the U.S. Army Reserve, he became Assistant Attorney General for Kansas. Elected District Attorney in Johnson County, Kansas in 1976, 1980 and 1984, he was subsequently elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1998, where he serves as a member of the House Committees on the Budget, Financial Services, and Science.
Comissioners

Hon. Jack Reed  A United States Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Reed is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and a U.S. Army veteran. After graduating from Harvard Law School, he was elected to the Rhode Island State Senate in 1984 and to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1990. First elected to the U.S. Senate in 1996, he is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, and the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

Hon. Pat Roberts  A United States Senator from Kansas, Mr. Roberts served in the United States Marine Corps and subsequently worked as a journalist and congressional staff member. Elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1980 for the First District of Kansas, he served eight terms. First elected to the U.S. Senate in 1996, he is Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. He also chairs the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Hon. Leonard L. Boswell  A member of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. Boswell represents the Third District of Iowa. A combat-decorated Vietnam veteran, he was elected to the Iowa Senate in 1984. First elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1996, he serves as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the Agriculture Committee.

Hon. Jerry Moran  A member of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. Moran represents the First District of Kansas, which includes Abilene, the site of the Eisenhower family home, the Eisenhower Library, and the Eisenhower Center. After working in the fields of banking and law, he was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1996. He serves as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the Veterans’ Affairs Committee. The Assistant Majority Whip, he is also a trustee of the Eisenhower Foundation.

Hon. Mac Thornberry  A member of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. Thornberry represents the Thirteenth District of Texas. After graduating from the University of Texas Law School in 1983, he worked as a congressional staff member. In 1988, he was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs. First elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1994, he serves as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, Budget Committee, and Select Committee on Homeland Security, and is the Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Science, and Research & Development.

David Eisenhower  The grandson of President Eisenhower, David Eisenhower served in the U.S. Navy and afterward launched a successful career as a writer. His 1986 book Eisenhower At War: 1943-1945, was a New York Times best-seller and a finalist for the Pulitzer Prize. He has served as a lecturer in Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania since 1981 and is currently writing two sequels to Eisenhower At War. He is the editor of Orbis.
Alfred Geduldig  A principal in the firm of Geduldig & Ferguson, Mr. Geduldig is a senior executive in the fields of corporate communications and public affairs. He joined Mobil in 1964 as the architect of its public relations program. In 1974 he was named Vice President, Public Affairs, for GAF Corporation, and in 1983 he joined The Travelers as Vice President, Corporate Communications. He has been a member of the Private Sector Advisory Council for USIA and the communications advisory committee of the United Way of New York.

Susan Banes Harris  An attorney and legislative affairs specialist, Ms. Harris graduated cum laude from the American University Law School in 1979. After serving as Director of the Washington Action Office of the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, she served as Assistant Director of the Staffing Unit for the Clinton-Gore transition team in 1992. Subsequently, she served as Washington Representative of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and as a consultant for Heidepriem & Morgan, Inc., and the Hadassah Washington Action Office.

ABOUT THE LEGACY COMMITTEE

The Eisenhower Memorial Commission recognized the importance of understanding the outstanding elements of Dwight D. Eisenhower’s historical legacy. In April 2002, Louis Galambos, Co-Editor of *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower* and Professor of History at the Johns Hopkins University, agreed to chair the Eisenhower Legacy Committee. The committee, which included a select group of leading experts, was organized into three subcommittees, to consider Eisenhower as general, as president, and as an American citizen who devoted his life to public service.

Serving on the Committee with Professor Galambos were:

* Michael J. Birkner,  Chair of the history department at Gettysburg College, a biographer of Sherman Adams and scholar of 19th and 20th-century American politics.
* Robert R. Bowie,  Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Emeritus, Harvard University and Director of Policy Planning under President Eisenhower.
* Carlo D’Este,  Retired U.S. Army lieutenant colonel and author of four books about World War II, as well as a biography of George Patton and the recently released *Eisenhower: A Soldier’s Life* (2002).
* Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster,  Senior Fellow at the Eisenhower Institute, Staff Secretary and Defense Liaison Officer to President Eisenhower from 1954 until 1961, and Commander of NATO from 1969 until 1974.
John H. Morrow, Jr., Franklin Professor of History at the University of Georgia and a noted military historian.

Kiron K. Skinner, Scholar of American public policy, foreign policy and history at Carnegie Mellon University, and currently the W. Glenn Campbell Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution.

Richard Norton Smith, Director of the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics at the University of Kansas and nationally recognized authority on the American presidency.

Daun van Ee, Historian with the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress and Co-Editor of The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Louis Galambos  Chair of the Legacy Committee, and a faculty member at Rice University, Rutgers University, and Yale University before going to Johns Hopkins. A former editor of The Journal of Economic History, he served as President of the Economic History Association. He has written extensively on American business history, business-government relations, the history of modern institutional development, and the process of innovation in the public and private sectors. His numerous publications include “The U.S. Corporate Economy in the Twentieth Century” (in Volume Three of The Cambridge Economic History of the United States, 2000); Networks of Innovation: Vaccine Development at Merck, Sharp & Dohme, and Mulford, 1895-1995, co-authored with Jane Eliot Sewell (1998); and Anytime, Anywhere: Entrepreneurship and the Creation of a Wireless World (2002), co-authored with Eric John Abrahamson. In addition to editing 17 volumes of the Eisenhower Papers, he has edited the Cambridge University Press series Studies in Economic History and Policy: The United States in the Twentieth Century.

Michael Beschloss  Award-winning historian of the Presidency and the author of seven books. Newsweek has called him “the nation’s leading Presidential historian.” He is a regular commentator on PBS’s The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer and a contributor to ABC News. An alumnus of Eaglebrook School, Andover, Williams College, and Harvard University, Beschloss is the celebrated author of Mayday: Eisenhower, Khrushchev and the U-2 Affair (1986); The Crisis Years: Kennedy and Khrushchev, 1960-1963 (1991); Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963-1964 (1997); Reaching for Glory (2001), the second volume on the Johnson tapes, covering 1964 and 1965; and The Conquerors: Roosevelt, Truman and the Destruction of Hitler’s Germany, 1941-1945 (2002). Beschloss is a member of the American Historical Association and a Fellow of the Society of American Historians and sits on boards of the White House Historical Association, the National Archives Foundation, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation (Monticello) and the Urban Institute. He is currently working on a history of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

Michael J. Birkner  Chair of the History Department at Gettysburg College, a biographer of Eisenhower’s Chief of Staff Sherman Adams, and a scholar of 19th and 20th-century American politics, Prof. Birkner teaches a senior seminar
on “Dwight D. Eisenhower and His Times.” A graduate of Gettysburg College, Birkner received his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Virginia. His most recent books are *McCormick of Rutgers: Scholar, Teacher, Public Historian* (2001), and *James Buchanan and the Political Crisis of the 1850s* (1996).

**Robert R. Bowie**  Dillon Professor of International Affairs, Emeritus, Harvard University and Director of Policy Planning under President Eisenhower, Prof. Bowie is former Director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard. He served as the State Department member of the National Security Council Planning Board during the Eisenhower administration (1953-1957). In addition to his service to President Eisenhower, Prof. Bowie also served in the Truman, Johnson, and Carter administrations. His books include (with Richard H. Immerman) *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy* (1998) and *Suez 1956* (1985).


**General Andrew J. Goodpaster**  Senior Fellow at the Eisenhower Institute and Staff Secretary and Defense Liaison Officer to President Eisenhower from 1954 until 1961, General Goodpaster’s public service spans seven decades. After graduating from West Point, he commanded the 48th Engineer Combat Battalion during World War II in North Africa and Italy. He later commanded the 8th Infantry Division in Europe (1961-1962), served as Commandant of the National War College, Deputy Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (1968-1969), and Supreme Allied Commander of NATO forces (1969-1974). He also advised Presidents Nixon and Carter. Re-called to active duty, he served as Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point (1977-1981). General Goodpaster holds an M.A. and Ph.D. from Princeton University and has been awarded the U.S. Medal of Freedom, the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medals (Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force), the Silver Star and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

**John H. Morrow, Jr.**  Franklin Professor of History at the University of Georgia and a noted military historian, Prof. Morrow was awarded his Ph.D. in modern European History from the University of Pennsylvania. He became the first African-American faculty member of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1971 and served as Chair of the University’s History Department from 1983 to 1988. Since then, he has taught at the University of Georgia, serving as Chair of the History Department from 1991 to 1993 and as Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences from 1993 to 1995. He is the author of three works on early air power. Prof. Morrow’s book *The Great War in the Air: Military Aviation from 1909 to*
1921 (1993), is widely regarded as the definitive study of air power in the first World War. He authored the chapter on air war in the *Oxford Illustrated History of the First World War* (1998). Prof. Morrow is a frequent lecturer at the National War College, the Air War College, the National Air and Space Museum, and the U.S. Naval Academy. He has chaired the History Advisory Committee to the Secretary of the Air Force, served on the History Advisory Committee to the Department of the Army, and consulted with the U.S. Air Force Academy.

**Kiron K. Skinner**  
Scholar of American public policy, foreign policy, and history, Professor Skinner is a Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution and an Assistant Professor of history, political science, and public policy at Carnegie Mellon University. She is Co-Editor of *Reagan, In His Own Hand: The Writings of Ronald Reagan that Reveal his Revolutionary Vision for America* (2001) and of *Reagan: A Life in Letters* (2003). She is a member of Secretary Donald Rumsfeld’s Defense Policy Board.

**Richard Norton Smith**  
Director of the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics at the University of Kansas, Mr. Smith is a nationally recognized authority on the American presidency and a familiar face to viewers of C-Span, as well as *The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, where he appears regularly as part of the show’s round table of historians. Smith graduated *magna cum laude* from Harvard University in 1975 with a degree in government. His first major book, *Thomas E. Dewey and His Times*, was a finalist for the 1983 Pulitzer Prize. He has also written *An Uncommon Man: The Triumph of Herbert Hoover* (1984), *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation* (1986) and *Patriarch: George Washington and the New American Nation* (1993). In June 1997, Houghton Mifflin published Mr. Smith’s *The Colonel: The Life and Legend of Robert R. McCormick*, which received the prestigious Goldsmith Prize awarded by Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School, and has been described by Hilton Kramer as “the best book ever written about the press.” He has served as director of four presidential libraries, among them the Eisenhower Presidential Library, where he organized the Eisenhower Centennial on behalf of the National Archives. Best-known as a historian and biographer, Smith is currently at work on a life of Nelson A. Rockefeller, to be published in 2006.

**Daun van Ee**  
Historian with the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, Daun van Ee received his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins. Serving in the U.S. Army in Vietnam, he won the Combat Infantryman’s Badge and the Bronze Star. He was Assistant Editor of the *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower* from 1974 to 1977, Executive Editor from 1977 to 1995, and Editor from 1995 to 2001. His publications include *David Dudley Field and the Reconstruction of the Law* (Garland, 1986), and “From the New Look to the Flexible Response,” in *Against All Enemies: Interpretations of American Military History* (Greenwood, 1986).
Let’s ask what’s best for America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER
The assessment of a major historical figure is a daunting task. The committee that produced this report could not have evaluated Eisenhower’s legacy without drawing on the work of many other individuals, groups and organizations.

It was fortuitous that the multi-year, multi-million dollar project to publish Dwight David Eisenhower’s papers was concluded in 2002, the year in which this committee was asked to provide its assessment of the Eisenhower legacy. The Legacy Committee could thus draw upon the extensive database supplied by the 21 volumes of published papers, as well as the other materials collected by the many talented researchers who worked on the Papers project over the years.

An early associate editor of the Eisenhower Papers, Stephen Ambrose, was also the biographer who did much to introduce Eisenhower to the American public. His work and that of other leading scholars in history and political science stimulated further study of both like the general and like the president. Over time, this process of scholarly research, debate, and writing produced a new assessment and a powerful appreciation of Eisenhower’s positive contributions to American society.

This complex, meticulous process — grinding fine like the mills of the gods — was greatly facilitated by having the support of the presidential library in Abilene, Kansas, with its enormous collection of papers and artifacts and its talented, experienced staff. The dedication of its staff and benefactors ensures that the scholarly understanding of the Eisenhower legacy will continue to increase through the years.

The continuing flow of articles, editorials, and books concerning the Eisenhower legacy provides a good measure of the richness and depth of his achievements in the United States and abroad. Thus, the present report is only a benchmark in what will be the continuing examination and reinterpretation of the Eisenhower story. That story has already been enriched by the many who have contributed to this committee’s work, and we would like to acknowledge our debts, individually and collectively, to those scholars and citizens who have analyzed and described Eisenhower’s long career as a public servant.

Several individuals made special contributions to the final edition of this report. Jennifer Sessums and Celesa Gibbs designed the report format. The committee benefited from Michael Richman’s thorough research on President Eisenhower’s understanding and support of memorialization. Richard Striner provided invaluable editorial assistance. Very useful research summaries were prepared by Herman Wolk, Senior Historian of the U. S. Air Force, and by R. Cargill Hall, Chief Historian, National Reconnaissance Office. The committee appreciates the support that was received from the Eisenhower family. Evan Thompson’s thoughtful ideas provided valuable stimulation, and Andrew Demetriou provided consistently astute advice. Our thanks go also to Drew Ross for his interest in the committee’s contribution to Eisenhower’s memorialization, and to Justin Gilstrap for his administrative assistance to the committee. Eileen Krichten kept the Committee’s wheels turning, and Carl Reddel provided the leadership that all effective organizations need.